

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed September 24, 2003, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for One Month Extension of Time*, which extends the shortened statutory period for response to January 24, 2004. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on June 8, 1999 and August 21, 2001.

Claims 2-13 and 20-23 are pending in the present application, of which claims 2-6, 8, 20 and 21 are independent, and claims 4 and 5 are withdrawn. The independent claims have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Initially, the Examiner is thanked for the interview granted to the Applicant's representative on Tuesday, January 20, 2003. Examiner Peralta indicated that the fifth step of claim 2 (which is identical to the fifth step of claims 3-5, the sixth step of claims 6 and 8, and the second forming step of claims 20 and 21) is unclear. The Applicant's representative and Examiner Peralta agreed that the claims could be amended to more positively recite the formation of a portion of a pixel matrix circuit and a portion of a driving circuit. Specifically, Examiner Peralta agreed that patentable weight would be given to a portion of a pixel matrix circuit or a portion of a driving circuit if the independent claims were to be amended as follows:

a fifth step of forming ~~a portion of a pixel matrix circuit comprising a first thin film transistor using said first semiconductor island, and forming a portion of a driving circuit comprising a second thin film transistor using said second semiconductor island, and~~

a sixth step of forming a portion of a pixel matrix circuit comprising said first thin film transistor, and forming a portion of a driving circuit comprising said second thin film transistor.

Similar amendments would be made to claims 3-6, 8, 20 and 21, as appropriate. By the present Amendment, the independent claims have been amended in accordance with the above-referenced interview.

Paragraph 2 of the Official Action rejects claims 2-3 and 20-23 as obvious based on the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,830,784 to Zhang et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,569,610 to Zhang et al., and U.S. Patent 5,869,803 to Noguchi et al. Paragraph 3 of the Official Action rejects claims 6-13 as obvious based on the combination of Zhang '784, Zhang '610, JP 09-312260 to Ohtani et al., and Noguchi. The Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present invention, as amended.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2143.01, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).


The prior art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all the features of the independent claims, as amended. The independent claims have been

amended to recite forming a first thin film transistor using the first semiconductor island, and forming a second thin film transistor using the second semiconductor island, and forming a portion of a pixel matrix circuit comprising the first thin film transistor, and forming a portion of a driving circuit comprising the second thin film transistor. Zhang '784, Zhang '610, Ohtani and Noguchi do not teach or suggest at least the above-referenced feature of the present invention.

Since Zhang '784, Zhang '610, Ohtani and Noguchi do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789